

REMARKS

Presently, claims 1-2, 4-17, 20, 22-28, 32-34, 36 and 38-51 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 18-19, 21, 29-31, 35 and 37 have been canceled. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 3. Claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 18. New independent claim 51 has been added to recite the allowable subject matter of independent claim 13 and dependent claim 19. Independent claim 28 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claims 30, 31 and 35. Additionally, claims 1, 4-9, 13, 20, 22-23, 25-26, 28, 32-34, 36, 38-43, 46-47 and 49 have been amended to more clearly recite the present invention, correct indefiniteness and other formal errors noted by Applicant, place the claims in better U.S. form and correct dependency in view of the other amendments to the claims. Claim 49 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection as noted below. Since the claim amendments are of a formal nature, no new matter has been added to the application by the foregoing amendments.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 49 and 50 for being incorrectly dependent on claim 21.

Per the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has amended claim 49 to be dependent on claim 42. As such, both claims 49 and 50 are properly dependent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to claims 49 and 50 are respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections – § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 28-33, 39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by International Patent Publication No. WO 99/26415 to Bar-El ("Bar-El").

Although not necessarily agreeing with the Examiner, Applicant has amended independent claim 28 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of original claim 35 (including the subject matter of original claims 30 and 31). Thus, claim 28 is believed to be allowable over Bar-El. Claims 32-33, 39 and 41 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claim 28. Claims 29-31 have been canceled. Accordingly, the Examiner's § 102(b) rejection of claims 28-33, 39 and 41 is moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 28, 29, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks *et. al* ("Hendricks").

Although not necessarily agreeing with the Examiner, Applicant has amended independent claim 28 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of original claim 35 (including the subject matter of original claims 30 and 31). Thus, claim 28 is believed to be allowable over Hendricks. Claim 38 is allowable at least by its dependency on independent claim 28. Claims 29 and 37 have been canceled. Accordingly, the Examiner's § 102(e) rejection of claims 28, 29, 37 and 38 is moot.

Prior Art Rejections – § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bar-El.

Although not necessarily agreeing with the Examiner, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of original claim 3. Additionally, independent claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of original claim 18. Thus, independent claims 1 and 13 are believed to be allowable over Bar-El. Claims 2, 4 and 10-17 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claims 1 and 13, respectively. Accordingly, the Examiner's obviousness rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 10-17 is moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 26 and 27 as being unpatentable over Bar-El in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,721 to Safadi.

As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 13 are believed to be allowable over Bar-El, since claims 1 and 13 include the allowable subject matter of original claims

3 and 18, respectively. Claims 9, 26 and 27 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claims 1 and 13, respectively. Accordingly, the Examiner's obviousness rejection of claims 9, 26 and 27 is moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 34 and 40 as being unpatentable over Bar-El in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,378,130 to Adams.

As discussed above, independent claim 28 is believed to be allowable over Bar-El, since claim 28 includes the allowable subject matter of original claim 35 (including the subject matter of original claims 30 and 31). Claims 34 and 40 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claim 28. Accordingly, the Examiner's obviousness rejection of claims 34 and 40 is moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has allowed claims 42-50. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 42 is allowable. Accordingly, claims 43-50 are allowable at least by their dependency on claim 42.

The Examiner has objected to claims 3, 5-8, 18-25, 35 and 36, but stated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of original claim 3. Thus, claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate all features of the base claim (original claim 1). Claim 3 has been canceled. Therefore, the Examiner's objection to claims 3 and 5-8 is overcome. Dependent claims 2 and 4-12 are allowable at least by their dependency on amended claim 1.

Claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the features of original claim 18. Thus, claim 18 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate all features of the base claim (original claim 13). Additionally, new independent claim 51 recites the subject matter of original claim 13 and the allowable subject matter of original claim 19. Thus, claim 19 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate all features of the base claim (original claim 13). Claims 18, 19 and 21 have been canceled. Therefore, the Examiner's objection to claims 18-25 is overcome. Dependent claims 14-17, 20 and 22-27 are allowable at least by their dependency on amended claim 13 and new independent claim 51, respectively.

Claim 28 has been amended to incorporate the features of original claim 35. Thus, claim 35 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate all features of the base claim (original claim 28) and all intervening claims (original claims 30 and 31). Claims 29-31, 35 and 37 have been canceled. Therefore, the Examiner's objection to claims 35 and 36 is overcome. Dependent claims 32-34, 36, 38-50 are allowable at least by their dependency on amended claim 28. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to claims 3, 5-8, 18-25, 35 and 36 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome, and that the application, including claims 1-2, 4-17, 20, 22-28, 32-34, 36 and 38-51, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's objections and rejections and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

June 6, 2005

By: _____

Charles A. Eldering

Charles A. Eldering
Registration No. 39,180
Technology, Patents, & Licensing, Inc.
6206 Kellers Church Road
Pipersville, PA 18947
Telephone: 215-766-2100
Facsimile: 215-766-2920